NDMC in turn entered into licence agreement with the two hotels. No facilities were granted to the NDMC while allotting the plots in question. According to NDMC's report the two hotels were required to complete construtcion and commission only 100 to 150 rooms before the commencement of Asian Games, 1982 and hotels had completed and commissioned these rooms in time.

(b) the NDMC have reported that according to the licence deed the hotels were granted moratorium on payment of licence fee falling due in 1982-83. This facility has been extended by NDMC from time to time and is now valid upto 30th September, 1987 in the case of Meridian hotel and 30th November, 1987 in the case of Bharat Hotel.

(c) The NDMC have granted moratorium to M/s. Prominent Hotels Ltd. upto 30th June, 1987.

(d) According to NDMC the moratorium amount and interst payable by the hotels are as follows:—

(i) *Meridian Hotel (Upto Sep.,1987)*	
Moratorium amount	Rs. 13·40 Crores
Interest	Rs. 5.56 Crores
(ii) *Bharat Hotel (Upto 16-11-87)*	
Moratorium amount	Rs. 5·80 Crores
Interest	Rs. 2·00 Crores

Rise in input costs

2319. SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:

SHRI KAILASH PATI MISHRA:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the total rise in percentage of the input costs, during the whole period of 1982-85 regarding wheat crop in Haryana and Punjab, paddy in Punjab and Assam, Barley in Rajasthan and cotton in Gujarat, Maharashtra and Punjab;

(b) what has been the corresponding total rise in percentage of their support prices during the same period; and

(c) whether the farmers have been comparatively losers as a result thereof and if so, the extent thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): (a) and (b) The available information is given in the statement. (See below.)

(c) The support/procurement prices fixed by the Government are generally higher than the cost of production of agricultural commodities and thus provide a reasonable margin of profit to farmers. This gives the necessary incentives to them for investment and adoption of improved technology. However, variations may occasionally manifest in case of some crops due to agro-climatic and other factors.

Statement

Percentage increase/decrease of input costs and Support Prices of Different crops over 1981-82

Crop	States	Input cost			Support Price (All India)		
		1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1982-83	1933-84	1934-85
1. Wheat	Haryana	10·4	15·2	15.5	6·3	7.0	10·6
	Punjab	5·4	15·7	14·8			
2. Paddy	Assam	(—) 2.4	14·7	26.0	6.1	14·8	19·1
	Punjab	1·5	19·6	33·9			
3. Barley*	Rajasthan	2·5	11·2	11·8	...	...	...
4. Cotton*	Gujarat	4.6	20.6	...	...	...	...
	Maharashtra	17·4	(—) 8.9	...			
	Punjab	20.1	79·1	7·8			

Note: * indicate that % are not worked out because the minimum support prices for 1981-82 were not announced.

Based on data from Comprehensive Scheme for Studying the Cost of Cultivation of Principal Crops.

Legal action by NAFED against auditors

2320. DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether NAFED intends to take legal action against the statutory auditors of Government for recording mismanagement of NAFED in its Audit Report of 1983-84;

(b) how many meetings of the Sub-Committee constituted by the NAFED were held and what were its deliberations, with details thereof;

(c) whether Government are also thinking to take action against its Auditors or against NAFED; and

(d) if so, what actions are proposed to be taken by Government?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI G. S. DHILLON): (a) and (b) The Board of Directors of NAFED constituted a Sub-Committee which held two meetings in May and June, 1986, and recommended that a complaint may be filed against the auditors with the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. Accordingly, NAFED complained to the Institute against certain observations made in the Audit Report of 1983-84 which NAFED considered as not correct, derogatory, lacking decency of parliamentary language and not logical. In reply, the Institute informed NAFED that in their opinion, *prima-facie* the auditors were not guilty of any professional or other misconduct. The Institute also informed NAFED that since the complaint was neither a frivolous one nor had it been made with any malafide intention, the fee of Rs. 50 deposited alongwith the complaint was being refunded. No final view on legal action, if any, against the